

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL STATUS AND BEHAVIOR
PROBLEMS IN A GROUP OF SEVENTH GRADE
NEGRO STUDENTS

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

BY
HELEN JEANNE COOPER

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

AUGUST, 1950

R- V. i T- 92

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to the seventh grade pupils, who served as subjects, and their home-room teachers, who served as raters, in the five Atlanta elementary schools and the Atlanta University Laboratory School. Special mention is also given the superintendent of public schools in Atlanta and to the principals of the various schools who made the subjects available for this study.

Appreciation is given to Dr. Esther Milner and Dr. O. W. Eagleson who criticized the study and assisted the writer in its formulation.

The writer is also indebted to Dr. Mozell Hill, head of the Sociology Department, Atlanta University, who familiarized the writer with the techniques involved in the computation of the Index of Status Characteristics.

H. J. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Definition of Terms	2
Related Literature	4
II. COLLECTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE DATA	9
Purpose and Division of the Chapter . .	9
The Sample	9
The Procedure	18
III. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS	21
Ratings by Best Friends and Least-Liked Acquaintances	21
Ratings by the Teachers	31
Self-Ratings	40
Stogdill Behavior Cards	46
Comparison of Ratings and Stogdill Behavior Cards	56
Sex Differences	59
IV. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY .	71
Conclusions Growing out of Analysis . .	71
Relationship of Conclusions to Previous Findings	78
Recommendations for Further Study . . .	80
Significance of Study	81
Summary	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
APPENDIX	87
Appendix A	88
Appendix B	89
Appendix C	90
Appendix D	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of ISC Scores of Test Sample .	12
2. Proportional Classification of Three Populations as Regards Social Class	13
3. Distribution of Chronological Ages and Sex of Subjects Grouped According to Social Class	14
4. Distribution of the Intelligence Quotients and the Reading Grades of Subjects	15
5. Distribution of ISC Scores of Best Friends and Least-Liked Acquaintances Selected By the Subjects	17
6. Distribution of the Ratings Given the Subjects by their Best Friends on the Hagerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A	21
7. Distribution of the Ratings Given the Subjects by their Least-Liked Acquaintances on the Behavior Rating Scale	22
8. Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Upper-Middle Class by their Best Friends and their Least-Liked Acquaintances	24
9. Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given the Subjects in the Lower-Middle Class by Their Best Friends and Least-Liked Acquaintances	25
10. Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Upper-Lower Class by Their Best Friends and Their Least-Liked Acquaintances	26
11. Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Lower-Lower Class by Their Best Friends and Their Least-Liked Acquaintances	27

Table		Page
12.	Coefficients of Correlation Between the Ratings Given the Subjects by Their Best Friends and Least-Liked Acquaintances . . .	30
13.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Upper-Middle Class by the Teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule . .	32
14.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Lower-Middle Class by the Teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule . .	33
15.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Upper-Lower Class by the Teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule . .	34
16.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Behavior Ratings Given Subjects in the Lower-Lower Class by the Teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule . .	35
17.	Distribution of the Ratings Given the Subjects by Their Teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule . .	37
18.	The Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of the Five Social Classes as Rated by the Homeroom Teachers	38
19.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Self-Ratings Made by the Subjects in the Upper-Middle Class on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule	41
20.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Self-Ratings Made by the Subjects in the Lower-Middle Class on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule	42
21.	Distribution of the Frequencies of Self-Ratings Made by the Subjects in the Upper-Lower Class on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule	43

Table	Page
22. Distribution of the Self-Ratings Made by the Subjects in the Lower-Lower Class on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule	44
23. Distribution of Self-Ratings by Subjects in the Five Social Classes on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule	45
24. Distribution of the Total Scores on the Behavior Scale as Rated by the Teachers According to Social Groupings	47
25. Distribution of the Total Scores in the Self-Ratings According to Social Class Groupings	48
26. Order of Subject Behavior Problems' Ratings by Best Friend, Least-Liked Acquaintances, Teacher and Self	49
27. Distribution of "Yes" Responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards by the Fifty Subjects	50
28. The Reliability of the Difference Between the Means Obtained by the Subjects on the Stogdill Behavior Cards	51
29. Distribution of the Per Cent of "Yes" Responses and the Rank of the Percentages on the Stogdill Behavior Cards	54
30. Coefficients of Correlation Between the Self-Ratings and the Ratings Made by the Best Friends on the Behavior Rating Scale	57
31. Coefficients of Correlation Between the Self-Ratings and the Ratings Made by the Least-Liked Acquaintances on the Behavior Scale	57
32. Coefficients of Correlation Between Scores Made by the Subjects on the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the Self-Ratings on the Behavior Rating Schedule	58

Table	Page
33. Distribution of the Frequencies of "Yes" Responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards According to the Sex of the Subjects . . .	60
34. The Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of the Middle and Lower Social Classes Within Each Sex Group on the Stogdill Behavior Cards	61
35. Distribution of Self-Ratings According to Sex	62
36. The Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of the Middle and Lower Social Classes for Each Sex Group	63
37. Distribution of the Ratings by Homeroom Teachers on the Behavior Rating Schedule According to the Sex of the Subject . . .	65
38. Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of the Middle and the Lower Classes as Rated by the Homeroom Teachers	66
39. Distribution of the Behavior Ratings by the Best Friends According to the Sex of the Subjects	67
40. Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of Middle and Lower Class Boys and Girls as Rated by Best Friends	68
41. Distribution of the Ratings by the Least-Liked Acquaintances According to the Sex of the Subject	69
42. Reliability of the Difference Between the Means of the Middle and Lower Class Boys and Girls as Rated by the Least-Liked Acquaintances	70

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem.--- Directed observation of children in the classroom and play situations led the writer to the hypothesis that the various deviations in behavior of these children were in some way related to their social backgrounds. The problem involved in this study, therefore, was to determine whether the behavior problems manifested by Negro children varied from class to class. More concisely, the problem was to determine the extent to which the social class of the parents was related to the behavior problems manifested by the children. The specific hypothesis is that there is a wide range of behavior problems in each class and that these behavior problems vary in each class qualitatively rather than quantitatively, as measured by the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A and the Stogdill Behavior Cards.

The following statement given by Shaeffer relates specifically to the problem involved in this study and supports the writer's belief that there is, indeed, a need for scientific research in this area:

... Human beings are being directly affected by many findings and opinions which have been arrived at in an unscientific manner; and such conditions are unjust and unwise both from a humanitarian and logical point of view.

The situation is especially acute, it seems to the author, in the case of children, teenagers, and young adults. They, especially, are the ones in our society who are most caught up in the restrictions and frustrations which seem to be a part of civilized living; and it is their actions which are often officially judged and acted upon...The findings stand to support the author's contention, for instance, that a functional headache in a middle class boy and repeated truancies from school by a lower class boy are homologous in the sense that both boys may be reacting to the same frustration but in a dissimilar manner, determined, respectively, by social class value-attitudes.

Turned around, it is contended by the author that when a middle class boy is found to be repeatedly truant from school whereas his lower class companion is found to develop obviously psychosomatic difficulties there is more valid reason to suspect the possibility of a bona fide case of delinquency in the case of the middle class boy and a neurosis in the lower class boy. Each, in this latter instance, has departed from the precepts of his social class status--something to be really worried about than in the former instance where social class status behavior is expected but also acted upon.¹

Definition of Terms.--- The writer has adopted the following definition of terms in this study:

1. Behavior Problem refers to any undesirable responses given by the child to the Stogdill Behavior Cards, or any items rated as occurring once or twice, or occasionally, and/or frequently

¹

Louis E. Shaeffer, "The Variation of Clinically Observed Adjustment Responses with Social Class Status in a group of United States Army Soldiers." Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1948, p. 103.

on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A.

2. Social Class as used in this study refers to the five classes listed below which were derived from the Index of Status Characteristics¹ (ISC) of each subject. This study made use of a modified form of the ISC based on the indices of occupation, education and source of income.² Scores on the ISC may range from 12 to 84, a score of 12 being the highest possible score with reference to social class and 84 being the lowest possible score.
 - a. Upper (U) class refers to the class in which the subjects with an ISC ranging from 12 to 22 fall.
 - b. Upper-Middle (UM) class consists of ISC scores ranging from 23 to 37.
 - c. Lower-Middle (LM) class consists of ISC scores ranging from 38 to 52.
 - d. The Upper-Lower (UL) class consists of ISC scores ranging from 53 to 66.
 - e. The Lower-Lower (LL) class consists of ISC scores ranging from 67 to 84.

¹W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (Chicago, 1949).

²Carson McGuire, "Social Status, Peer Status, and Social Mobility." Unpublished memorandum of the Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948.

Related Literature.-- The literature related to social class and behavior patterns, as such, was voluminous; however, studies dealing specifically with the relationship between certain behavior problems of children and the social class of the family were not available. The most closely-related study found was that of Shaeffer¹ who studied the variation of "overt" and "covert" adjustment responses of 337 adult males according to the "rises or falls on the social class status scale." Shaeffer concludes that those subjects who were classified in the lower-lower and upper-lower levels of the social class status system characteristically displayed "overt" adjustment responses, such as, absence without leave, physical or verbal assault, drunkenness and theft. On the other hand, those who were classified in the higher levels displayed "covert" adjustment responses, such as, headaches, nervousness, body pains, etc.

Such studies as those by Davis and Dollard,² Frazier³ Johnson,⁴ Sutherland,⁵ and Warner, Junker, and

¹Louis E. Shaeffer, op. cit., pp. 106-7.

²Allison Davis and John Dollard, Children of Bondage (Washington, D. C., 1940).

³E. Franklin Frazier, Negro Youth at the Crossways (Washington, D. C., 1940).

⁴Charles S. Johnson, Growing up in the Black Belt (Washington, D. C., 1941).

⁵Robert L. Sutherland, Color, Class and Personality (Washington, D. C., 1942).

Adams,¹ have pointed out the behavior patterns which are common among the members of given social classes in our society. This section will be devoted primarily to a discussion of these behavior patterns and other aspects related to behavior problems. Other studies will be compared with the findings of this study in the last chapter.

Neugarten² conducted a study to determine whether the social class position of the family was a contributing factor in the child's choice of friends, or in the child's reputation among his age mates. She compared the choices of children at two levels in school: one a group of fifth and sixth graders, the other a group of tenth and eleventh graders. Her conclusions reveal that children are selected as friends by children from their own social level more often than by children from other social levels. She further discovered that with the exception of the group of lowest status, children tend to select as friends, first, children of higher status than their own and, second children of their own status level." This indicates that the lower the social status of the subject, the fewer times he was mentioned as "best friend," but was frequently mentioned as "don't want for a friend."

¹ W. Lloyd Warner, Buford Junker, and Walter Adams, Color and Human Nature (Washington, D. C., 1941).

² Bernice L. Neugarten, "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children." Reprinted for private circulation from The American Journal of Sociology, LI (January, 1946), 305-13.

Lurie and others concluded that the "home is the bulwark and the chief resistance-point in warding off possible harmful effects of vicious and unwholesome environmental influences."¹ They found that ninety-nine per cent of the behavior disorders of 400 cases studied were "due entirely to bad neighborhood influences." This fact illustrates the importance of environmental factors in formulating desirable or undesirable behavior patterns.

Schneckenburger² compared attitudes of children from "proletarian" homes with attitudes of children of similar ages from middle class or "bourgeois" background. No differences appeared in reaction to pictures of boys (a) attacking a girl or (b) sticking a sleeping grandfather with a pin; but on (c) a picture of a thug clubbing a rich man, the testimony (oral) of the proletarian children showed twenty-eight per cent approving and fifteen per cent excusing, while among the bourgeois children only ten per cent approved and none suggested excuses.

¹ Lurie, et. al., "Environmental Influences," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XLIII (January, 1943).

²H. Schneckenburger, "Die Altersentwicklung und Milieubedingtheit des soziaethischen Verstandnisses beim proletarischen Kinde." (The Development to Maturity and the Conditioning influence of the Social Ethical Comprehension of the Child of the Proletarian), Zeitschrift fur angewandte Psychologie, XXXIV (1932) as cited in Watson Goodwin, "Social Attitudes," Journal of Educational Research, V (June, 1935), 267.

Relatively high rates of delinquency among Negroes were reported by Blanshard¹ who studied Negro delinquents in New York. Blanshard's findings suggested poverty as one of the most contributing factors in delinquency. In like manner, Hentig² attributed the high delinquency rate among Negro girls to the density of Negro population in delinquency areas, to instability of residence, broken marriages, and the unfavorable attitude toward Negroes of many law-enforcing agencies. On the other hand, Watts,³ in comparing two groups of adolescent Negroes, one delinquent and one non-delinquent, was unable to find an adequate explanation in terms of economic, social, or environmental factors.

Unlike some of the studies mentioned in this chapter, the writer will not use the term "delinquent behavior" or "delinquency" as synonymous with "behavior problems" in this study. It is felt that a legal term should not be adopted by research-minded persons as a psychologically-diagnostic term.

¹Paul Blanshard, "Negro Delinquency in New York," Journal of Educational Sociology, XVI (October, 1942), 115-23.

²Hans V. Hentig, "The Criminality of the Colored Woman," University of Colorado Studies in Social Science, I (May, 1942), 231-60.

³Frederick P. Watts, "A Comparative Clinical Study of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Negro Boys," Journal of Negro Education, X (April, 1941), 190-207.

These studies illustrate aspects of behavior which appear to have some measure of relationship with social class factors. The concensus of these studies is that the environmental factors play a very important role in the behavior patterns of members from all social classes.

CHAPTER II

COLLECTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE DATA

Purpose and Division of the Chapter.-- The primary purpose of this chapter is to present the data and a thorough classification of the data to the reader. The sample is presented in the first half and the procedure used in this study is presented in the last half of the chapter.

The Sample.-- The data used in this study were obtained from seventh grade students at the Oglethorpe Laboratory School of Atlanta University and five of the Negro public schools of Atlanta, Georgia, during the school year of 1950.

A Classification Sheet¹ was prepared to serve a two-fold purpose: (1) to secure personal information about the subjects and their parents or parent-persons, and (2) to enable the writer to become acquainted with the pupils by assisting them in filling in the blanks properly. There were 312 seventh grade students who responded to the items on the Classification Sheet and from this number fifty were selected according to the occupation of the parents or parent-persons and the reading grades of the students. According to the manual of the Stogdill

¹See Appendix A.

Behavior Cards,¹ it was necessary that the subjects have a reading grade of 4.5 or above so that adequate results could be obtained from the use of the Behavior Cards. The reading scores were obtained from the total reading score of the Iowa Silent Reading Test which had been given by the school personnel to the students earlier in the school year.

The selection of subjects according to the occupation of the parents was made through reference to the data presented by Pierce.² A careful observation of these data reveals that the greater proportion of the Negro population of Atlanta are servants, laborers and semi-skilled workers. These persons, if classified, would mainly fall in the upper-lower and lower-lower social classes. It therefore appeared to be important that the writer include a larger percentage of the subjects whose parents' occupations would be classified in these two classes than those of other social class groups.

The subjects were classified on Personality Cards³ and assigned to the social class⁴ into which the particular score fell. This form was obtained from the Sociology Department at Atlanta University and served

¹ R. M. Stogdill, "The Behavior Cards." Manual of Directions.

² J. A. Pierce, The Atlanta Negro (Atlanta, 1940).

³ See Appendix B.

⁴ See Appendix C.

as the basis for computing the ISC of the subjects and the subsequent assignment of a social class rating to the subjects.

Warner's¹ four indices for computing ISC are occupation, source of income, house type and dwelling area. These factors have been weighted into a somewhat standard scale. However, Warner recognized that other indices might be more appropriate in measuring status in some communities. Some of these alternate indices are: education, ethnicity, amount of income, religious affiliations, institutional membership. In this study it was more advisable to employ the following indices: occupation, education, and source of income. These indices have been weighted by Warner and McGuire² for computing the ISC and their reliability and validity are as statistically dependable as the other indices which Warner employs in his study of Jonesville.³

House type and dwelling area were omitted as indices in the scale for this study because, first, it was neither convenient nor practical to visit the home of each informant and rate that particular home. They were too widely scattered and the time and cost factors would have been prohibitive. In regard to area lived in, second, the entire city of Atlanta has not been rated by areas. This

¹W. Lloyd Warner, op. cit.

²J. Carson McGuire, op. cit., pp. 5-7.

³W. Lloyd Warner, Democracy in Jonesville (New York, 1949).

ethnological data were not available at the time of the study; therefore, it was impossible to give a score to the location of the informants used in this study. Moreover, it was felt that education was a more valid criterion for measuring social status in a Negro community.

Table I shows the social class distribution of the sample as derived from the ISC scores of the fifty subjects used in this study.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF ISC SCORES OF TEST SAMPLE

Social Class	No.	Per Cent of Test Sample	Mean	Median	Range
U	1	2	20.00	20.00	20-
UM	8	16	29.62	28.00	24-37
LM	13	26	43.46	44.00	38-49
UL	17	34	60.47	60.00	55-66
LL	11	22	71.36	71.00	67-76
Total	50	100			

The fifty subjects used in this study represent five of the six social classes which Warner¹ describes as

¹W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, op. cit.

existing in our society. The range of ISC scores was from 20 to 76, representing a five-class spread.

Table 2 shows the social class distribution of this population compared with that of two other populations.

TABLE 2
PROPORTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF THREE POPULATIONS
AS REGARDS SOCIAL CLASS STATUS

SC	Population of this Study ^a	Population of Yankee City ^b	Population of "Midwest" ^c
U	2.0	3.0	3.3
UM	16.0	10.2	7.4
LM	26.0	28.1	35.7
UL	34.0	32.6	41.7
LL	22.0	25.2	11.9

^aBased on fifty seventh grade students in Atlanta, Georgia.

^bBased on about 17,000 residents of an eastern seaboard city in the United States.¹

^cBased on about 2,000 families in a small midwestern city in the United States.²

This table might provide a partial basis upon which to consider the population of this study representative

¹W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven, 1941), p. 88.

²W. Lloyd Warner, et. al., "Midwest Study." Unpublished analyses of the Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948.

of social class status in the United States.

Throughout this study, the upper-class subject is being used for descriptive purposes only, and no attempt will be made to compare the single upper-class person with members of the other four social classes.

Table III shows the distribution of the chronological ages and the sex of the subjects used in this study within each of the five social class groupings.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF CHRONOLOGICAL AGES AND SEX OF
SUBJECTS GROUPED ACCORDING
TO SOCIAL CLASS

SC	N	Chronological Ages			Sex	
		Mean	Median	Range	Boys	Girls
U	1	12.0	12.0	12-	1	
UM	8	11.9	11.9	11-13	5	3
LM	13	12.0	12.0	11-15	7	6
UL	17	12.5	12.6	11-14	7	10
LL	11	12.3	12.0	12-13	9	2
Total	50				29	21

The chronological ages ranged from 11 to 15, with the subjects in the upper-lower class tending to be the oldest subjects and those in the upper-middle the youngest subjects. There are 30 boys and 20 girls in the study sample.

The upper-lower class has a larger number of boys; the middle classes are about equally distributed with reference to sex.

Table 4 shows the distribution of the intelligence test scores and the reading test scores of the study sample. The intelligence quotients of the subjects were derived from the Otis Quick Scoring Test of Mental Ability and the reading scores from the Iowa Silent Reading Test.

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS AND
THE READING GRADES OF SUBJECTS

SC	No.	Intelligence Quotients			Reading Grades		
		Mean	Median	Range	Mean	Median	Range
U	1	98	98	98-	4.9	4.9	4.9
UM	8	107	101	95-126	5.5	5.1	4.5-7.0
LM	13	104	105	77-135	5.9	5.7	4.5-9.5
UL	17	89	83	64-116	5.3	5.1	4.5-7.2
LL	11	88	84	60-100	5.1	5.1	4.5-5.9

The IQ's ranged from 60 to 135 with the lowest IQ falling in the lower-lower class and the highest IQ in the lower-middle class. The reading grades ranged from 4.5 to 9.5. The lowest reading grade, 4.5, was found in all classes and the highest reading grade, 9.5, was in the lower-middle class. The lower-middle class subjects tended to have higher reading grades than the subjects

in the other classes. The difference, however, is only in terms of months with the average reading grade for all the subjects being the fifth. The exception was the upper class subject who read on the fourth grade level.

Each subject was asked to write the name of his best friend and least-liked acquaintance on the Classification Sheet. This information was necessary because both the best friend and the least-liked acquaintance of each subject were expected to rate him on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A.

In securing this information, the writer found it necessary to explain the meaning of "least-liked acquaintance" to the pupils since they at first thought they were expected to designate a person whom they disliked. In explaining the meaning of this term to the group, the writer used the example of their wanting to invite several of their friends to a party to be given at their home. They were asked to write the name of the person in the class who would be the last person on their invitation list.

When this example did not suffice for a few (3 or 4) individuals, other examples were suggested by the teachers since they had more knowledge of the types of analogies which would elicit the desired responses from these subjects. These selections of best friends and the least-liked acquaintances are given in Table 5. This table shows the distribution according to the social class of

both the chooser and the chosen.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF ISC SCORES OF BEST FRIENDS AND
LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES SELECTED
BY THE SUBJECTS

SC of Chooser	Best Friends			Least-Liked Acquaintances		
	Range	Mode	SC of Chosen	Range	Mode	SC of Chosen
U	24-	24	UM	33-	33	UM
UM	34-76	62	UL	33-76	76	LL
LM	37-76	62	UL	37-76	71	LL
UL	45-76	71	LL	46-76	71	LL
LL	56-76	76	LL	51-73	71	LL

For the upper-middle class subjects, the selection of best friends ranged from upper-middle to lower-lower. More subjects selected their best friends from the upper-lower class than from any other class. The selection of least-liked acquaintances also ranged from the upper-middle to the lower-lower classes. In all the classes, with the exception of the upper class subject, a lower-lower class person was disliked by a majority of the subjects.

In the lower-middle class, the subjects' selection of their best friends ranged from the upper-middle class to the lower-lower class. In this class, also, upper-lower

class persons were selected as best friends by a majority of the subjects.

In the upper-lower class, the selection of best friends ranged from the lower-middle class to the lower-lower class. The lower-lower class persons were frequently selected as best friends.

In the lower-lower class, the selection of best friends ranged only from the upper-lower class to the lower-lower class. Lower-lower class persons were also selected as least-liked acquaintances by a large number of the subjects.

An analysis of the data reveals that a majority of the subjects selected their friends from classes lower than their own. For the most part, they selected their least-liked acquaintances from the lower classes. None of the members of the lower-middle class selected a person in their own class as being least-liked by them. This same fact is also true of the upper-lower class subjects. The social class of best friends varied widely and only in the lower-lower class was there a tendency for the subjects to select their best friends from within their own social class.

The Procedure.-- The best friend and the least-liked acquaintances for each subject were asked to rate each subject on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A¹ in individual conferences with the

¹

See Appendix D.

writer. In this study, imaginative lying was omitted from Schedule A because it was difficult for the raters (best friends and least-liked acquaintances) to distinguish between "imaginative lying" and "lying." The writer felt that the results obtained from using only "lying" were just as reliable as they would have been had this item been included.

The writer met with the friends and least-liked acquaintances of the test sample and asked them questions pertaining to the items on Schedule A. The writer rated each subject according to the responses given by the best friend or least-liked acquaintance of each subject. This method was used since it was felt that the pupils could not understand the procedure involved sufficiently adequately to rate the subjects themselves.

These subjects also met with the writer in individual conferences and were asked the same questions as had been asked of their best friends and least-liked acquaintances in order to obtain a score for self-rating on the behavior rating scale. The subjects were also asked to respond to the Stogdill Behavior Cards at the same conference or a later one.

The teachers were instructed as to the purpose of the study and were given the directions for rating the subjects. Preliminary instructions were given so that much of the subjectivity of many of the teachers might be alleviated.

The conference room was in most instances the library or a small room in the school building which was occupied only by the subject and the writer. The writer had spent, by this time, a good deal of time at each school and had become friendly with a number of the subjects. Thus, by the time the subjects and their raters met with her, it was felt that enough interpersonal rapport existed to obtain adequate responses.

Null hypotheses were formulated and tested according to the most adequate statistical formulas available. These results will be presented in Chapter 3 and the conclusions growing out of these results will be presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

Ratings by Best Friends and Least-Liked Acquaintances.-- The ratings of the best friends on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A for the subjects are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RATINGS GIVEN THE SUBJECTS
BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS ON THE HAGGERTY-
OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING
SCHEDULE: SCHEDULE A

SC	No.	Range	Average Scores	
			Mean	Median
U	1	24-	24.00	24.00
UM	8	0-28	12.75	12.00
LM	13	4-75	29.54	20.00
UL	17	11-72	26.35	21.00
LL	11	4-62	27.73	20.00

The ratings, considering all classes, ranged from 0 to 75. There is a wider range of scores in the lower-middle with the dispersion in the upper-lower and lower-lower classes similar to the lower-middle class. The

ratings of the test sample by their best friends tended to be higher in these three social class groups. In the upper-middle class, the ratings by the best friends are somewhat larger.

Table 7 shows the distribution of the ratings given the subjects by their least-liked acquaintances for the five social classes.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RATINGS GIVEN THE SUBJECTS BY
THEIR LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES ON THE
BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

SC	No.	Range	Average Scores	
			Mean	Median
U	1	42 -	42.00	42.00
UM	8	4 - 42	22.25	24.00
LM	13	0 - 62	23.62	20.00
UL	17	0 - 44	22.00	22.00
LL	11	0 - 60	31.45	28.00

In the upper-middle class, the range of the ratings was from 4 to 42. This range was the smallest in the distribution. The ratings in the lower-middle class ranged from 0 to 62. This range was the widest in the distribution. The range of the upper-lower class approximated the upper-middle class range. The lower-lower class range was approximately the same as the lower-middle class.

A comparison of the ratings given the subjects by their best friends and least-liked acquaintances with the norms¹ of the test population reveals that the average score made by the subjects in this study is higher than the test population. The devisers of this scale report a median of 8.6 from a test population of 2,163. The median of the test sample is 19.25 as rated by the best friends and least-liked acquaintances.

The behavior problems represented by the ratings received by the subjects are shown in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 on pages 24, 25, 26, and 27. These behavior problems will be interpreted for each class according to the score in the last column of each table. This score was obtained by multiplying the frequency by the weighted score given on each test. The rank for each behavior problem is also included in the last column.

In the upper-middle class, the ratings of the subjects by their best friends indicate that bullying is considered the greatest behavior problem of this grouping. On the other hand, temper outbursts was rated by the least-liked acquaintances as the greatest behavior problem. Unnecessary tardiness, lying, temper outbursts, cheating, marked overactivity, and unpopularity with other children were the other behavior problems listed by best friends of the upper-middle class group, in that order. The least-liked

¹M. E. Haggerty, W. C. Olson, and E. K. Wickman, "Manual of Directions." p. 8.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS AND THEIR LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE											
	Never		Once or Twice		Occasion-ally		Frequent-ly		Score		Score	
	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	RANK	LLA	RANK
Disinterest in School Work	8	5		2		1			0	-	14	6
Cheating	6	7	6	1	2				8	4	4	9
Unnecessary Tardiness	3	2	4	6	1				22	2	24	3
Lying	4	4	4	4					16	3	16	5
Defiance of Discipline	8	6		2					0	-	8	8
Marked Overactivity	7	8	1						8	4	0	-
Unpopular with Children	7	5	1	2		1			8	4	28	2
Temper Outbursts	6	2	2	5		1			16	3	52	1
Bullying	5	6	3	1		1			24	1	20	4
Speech Difficulties	8	8							0	-	0	-
Sex Offenses	8	8							0	-	0	-
Stealing	8	8							0	-	0	-
Truancy	8	8							0	-	0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	8	7		1					0	-	12	7
Total Score									102		178	

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS AND THEIR LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE											
	Never		Once or Twice		Occasion-ally		Frequent-ly		Score		Score	
	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	RANK	LLA	RANK
Disinterest in School Work	11	11	1	1	1	1			10	10.5	10	11
Cheating	11	9	1	2	1	1		1	10	10.5	21	7
Unnecessary Tardiness	6	7	4	5	3	1			34	5	26	4
Lying	7	8	2	3	3	2	1		33	6	24	5.5
Defiance of Discipline	9	9	2	2	1	2	1		21	8	20	8
Marked Overactivity	10	11	3	2					24	7	16	9
Unpopular with Children	8	9	4	3	1	1			44	4	36	3
Temper Outbursts	6	6	3	5	4	2			72	2	64	1
Bullying	5	8	6	4			2	1	76	1	46	2
Speech Difficulties	13	12		1					0	-	8	12
Sex Offenses	13	12		1					0	-	12	10
Stealing	13	13							0	-	0	-
Truancy	12	13	1						12	9	0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	10	11	1	2	2				48	3	24	5.5
Total Scores									384		307	

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-LOWER CLASS BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS AND THEIR LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE											
	Never		Once or Twice		Occasion-ally		Frequent-ly		Score		Score	
	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	RANK	LLA	RANK
Disinterest in School Work	8	15	3	2	1				18	10	8	10
Cheating	8	14	1	1	2	2	1		23	8	16	7
Unnecessary Tardiness	6	7	6	8	3	2	2		56	2	44	3
Lying	10	10	5	5	1		1	2	33	5	34	4
Defiance of Discipline	9	15	2	1	1	1			14	11	10	8
Marked Overactivity	13	14	2	2	2	1			40	4	28	5
Unpopular with Children	14	16	2	1	1				28	6	8	10
Temper Outbursts	3	7	12	9	2	1		1	120	1	90	2
Bullying	12	5	3	10	2	2			48	3	104	1
Speech Difficulties	15	16	1	1	1				20	9	8	10
Sex Offenses	16	17	1						12	12.5	0	-
Stealing	16	17	1						12	12.5	0	-
Truancy	17	17							0	-	0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	15	15	2	2					24	7	24	6
Total Scores									448		374	

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-LOWER CLASS BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS AND THEIR LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE											
	Never		Once or Twice		Occasion-ally		Frequent-ly		Score		Score	
	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	LLA	BF	RANK	LLA	RANK
Disinterest in School Work	11	9		2					0	-	8	11
Cheating	8	7	2	1	1	2		1	14	8	23	8
Unnecessary Tardiness	6	2	4	7	1	2			22	6	40	3.5
Lying	7	5	3	3		3	1		19	7	34	5
Defiance of Discipline	9	7	1	2	1	2			10	9	20	9
Marked Overactivity	10	8	1	3					8	10.5	24	6.5
Unpopular with Children	8	9	3			2			24	5	24	6.5
Temper Outbursts	5	6	6	5					48	2	40	3.5
Bullying	2	6	6	5	2		1		86	1	52	2
Speech Difficulties	10	11	1						8	10.5	0	-
Sex Offenses	9	11	1		1				30	4	0	-
Stealing	11	10		1					0	-	12	10
Truancy	11	11							0	-	0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	8	6	3	4				1	36	3	69	1
Total Scores									305		346	

acquaintances of the upper-middle class subjects listed unpopularity with peers, unnecessary tardiness, bullying, lying, disinterest in school work, obscene notes, talk of pictures, defiance of discipline, and cheating as the main behavior problems in the cited order.

In the lower-middle class, bullying was listed most frequently by best friends. The other problems listed in the order rated by the best friends, are: temper outbursts, obscene notes, talk or pictures, unpopularity with children, unnecessary tardiness, lying, marked overactivity, defiance of discipline, truancy, disinterest in school work and cheating. Their least-liked acquaintances rated temper outbursts as the major behavior problem. Bullying, unpopularity with children, unnecessary tardiness, lying, obscene notes, talk or pictures, cheating, defiance of discipline, marked overactivity, sex offenses, disinterest in school work, and speech difficulties were rated as behavior problems, in that order, by the least-liked acquaintances.

According to Table 10 on page 26, temper outbursts was rated by best friends as the leading behavior problem of the subjects in the upper-lower class. The other problems rated by the best friends were unnecessary tardiness, bullying, marked overactivity, lying, unpopularity with children, obscene notes, talk, or pictures, cheating, speech difficulties, disinterest in school work, defiance

of discipline, sex offenses and stealing, in that order. The least-liked acquaintances rated bullying as the major problem in this class grouping. Temper outbursts, unnecessary tardiness, lying, marked overactivity, obscene notes, talk or pictures, cheating, defiance of discipline, disinterest in school work, unpopularity with children and speech difficulties were also rated by the least-liked acquaintances as behavior problems, in that order.

According to Table 11 on page 27, bullying was rated by best friends as the major behavior problem of subjects in the lower-lower class. The other problems were: temper outbursts, obscene notes, talk or pictures, sex offenses, unpopularity with children, unnecessary tardiness, lying, disinterest in school work, defiance to discipline, marked overactivity, and speech difficulties. The problem listed as the number one problem by the least-liked acquaintances was obscene notes, talk, or pictures. Bullying, unnecessary tardiness, temper outbursts, lying, marked overactivity, unpopularity with children, cheating, defiance of discipline, stealing and disinterest in school work were also rated by the least-liked acquaintances as behavior problems, in that order.

Rho was computed to test the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the ratings made by the best friends and least-liked acquaintances. The results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE RATINGS
GIVEN THE SUBJECTS BY THEIR BEST FRIENDS
LEAST-LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

SC	N	df (N - 2)	Rho	Level of Significance
UM	8	6	.93	Very Significant
LM	13	11	.63	Significant
UL	17	15	.35	Not Significant
LL	11	9	.52	Not Significant

For the upper-middle class, rho was found to be .93 between the ratings given the subjects by their best friends and least-liked acquaintances. With two degrees of freedom (N - 2), rho was estimated to be significant at the .01 level of confidence, indicating that the relationship between the scores given the subjects by their best friends and least-liked acquaintances is very high.

Rho was found to be .63 between ratings given the lower-middle class subjects by their best friends and least-liked acquaintances. This correlation was significant at the .05 level of confidence, also indicating a significant relationship between these two ratings.

For the upper-lower class, rho was found to be .35 between the ratings given the subjects in this class by

their best friends and least-liked acquaintances. The test for significance indicated that the obtained coefficient was very likely due to chance.

Rho was .52 between the ratings given the subjects by their best friends and least-liked acquaintances in the lower-lower class. The test for significance was also found to be insignificant and chance factors taken to be operative.

Ratings by the Teachers.-- The results of the distribution of the ratings of the subjects by the teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A are shown in Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16, on pages 32, 33, 34 and 35 respectively.

An analysis of the behavior problems revealed by the scores indicate that as the ratings of the subjects by the teachers increase, there is a tendency for the subjects to move downward on the social scale.

In the upper-middle class, as shown in Table 13 on page 32, marked overactivity was rated by the teachers as the main behavior problem. Disinterest in school work, unpopularity with other children, speech difficulties, lying, and defiance of discipline were rated by the teachers as behavior problems, in the order listed.

According to Table 14 on page 33, the teachers also rated marked overactivity as the leading behavior problem in the lower-middle class. The other behavior problems,

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS
BY THE TEACHERS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE					Rank
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	
Disinterest in School Work	2	3	2	1	31	2
Cheating	8				0	-
Unnecessary Tardiness	8				0	-
Lying	7		1		6	6
Defiance of Discipline	7			1	7	5
Marked Overactivity	4	4			32	1
Unpopular with Children	6	2			16	3
Temper Outbursts	8				0	-
Bullying	8				0	-
Speech Difficulties	7	1			8	4
Sex Offenses	8				0	-
Stealing	8				0	-
Truancy	8				0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	8				0	-
Total Score					100	

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS
BY THE TEACHERS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	5	3	2	4	43	2
Cheating	11	1	1		10	12
Unnecessary Tardiness	11	2			8	13
Lying	11		1	1	13	9
Defiance of Discipline	11	1		1	11	11
Marked Overactivity	5	2	4	2	92	1
Unpopular with Children	10		1	2	40	3.5
Temper Outbursts	11	1		1	22	6
Bullying	10		1	2	40	3.5
Speech Difficulties	10		2	1	38	5
Sex Offenses	12	1			12	10
Stealing	13				0	-
Truancy	12		1		18	7.5
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	12		1		18	7.5
Total Score					365	

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-LOWER CLASS
BY THE TEACHERS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	6	8	2	1	51	4
Cheating	14	3			12	12
Unnecessary Tardiness	9	6	2		36	6
Lying	12		5		30	8.5
Defiance of Discipline	10	7			28	10
Marked Overactivity	14	2		1	30	8.5
Unpopular with Children	10	5	1	1	66	2
Temper Outbursts	10	5	1	1	66	2
Bullying	13	2	2		40	5
Speech Difficulties	14	1	2		32	7
Sex Offenses	16	1			12	12
Stealing	17				0	-
Truancy	16	1			12	12
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	12	4	1		66	2
Total Score					481	

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIOR RATINGS GIVEN SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-LOWER CLASS
BY THE TEACHERS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR SCHEDULES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	4		5	2	44	5.5
Cheating	7	3	1		18	10
Unnecessary Tardiness	5	3	3		30	8
Lying	7	4			16	11
Defiance of Discipline	4	5	1	1	33	7
Marked Overactivity	5	4	2		56	4
Unpopular with Children	3	7		1	70	3
Temper Outbursts	3	5	3		76	1
Bullying	6	4	1		44	5.5
Speech Difficulties	8	2	1		28	9
Sex Offenses	11				0	-
Stealing	11				0	-
Truancy	10	1			12	12
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	5	6			72	2
Total Score					499	

in the order listed, were: disinterest in school work, unpopularity with other children, bullying, speech difficulties, temper outbursts, truancy, obscene notes, talk, or pictures, lying, sex offenses, defiance of discipline, and unnecessary tardiness.

Unpopularity with other children, bullying, obscene notes, talk, or pictures were rated by the teachers with the highest frequency in the upper-lower class. The other problems, in the order rated, were: disinterest in school work, bullying, unnecessary tardiness, speech difficulties, lying, marked overactivity, defiance of discipline, cheating, sex offenses, and truancy.

According to Table 16 on page 35, the teachers rated temper outbursts as the major problem of the subjects in the lower-lower class. They also rated, in the order listed, obscene notes, talk or pictures, unpopularity with other children, marked overactivity, disinterest in school work, bullying, defiance of discipline, unnecessary tardiness, speech difficulties, cheating, lying, and truancy from school.

Table 17 shows the distribution of the ratings given the subjects by their teachers according to the social class groupings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RATINGS GIVEN THE SUBJECTS BY
THEIR TEACHERS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-
WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE

SC	No.	Range	Average Scores	
			Mean	Median
U	1	24-	24.00	24.00

UM	8	4-43	12.50	7.00
LM	13	0-99	29.00	16.00
UL	17	0-110	28.88	20.00
LL	11	0-81	45.36	57.00

This table shows that there is a wider range of behavior problems in the upper-lower class. However, the mean of the lower-lower class is higher than the upper-lower class mean, which indicates that there were more behavior problems in the lower-lower class as rated by the teachers.

The differences in the ratings of the subjects in the various social classes made by the teachers are shown in Table 18. The total rating for each class grouping was used to obtain the reliability of the difference. The null hypothesis involved is that there is no difference in the teachers' ratings of the subjects by the two social classes compared.

TABLE 18

THE RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OF THE FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES AS RATED BY
THE HOMEROOM TEACHERS

SC	No.	Mean	s	SE _D	t	Level
UM LM	8 13	12.50 29.00	27.80	11.40	1.45	.50
UM UL	8 17	12.50 28.88	25.60	10.75	1.52	.50
UM LL	8 11	12.50 45.36	26.80	12.60	2.60	.02
LM UL	13 17	29.00 28.88	31.20	11.54	.01	--
LM LL	13 11	29.00 45.36	10.70	4.38	3.74	.01
UL LL	17 11	28.88 45.36	30.30	11.82	1.39	.50

The standard error of the difference between the two means of the upper-middle and lower-middle classes was 11.40. The critical ratio was 1.45 and with 19 degrees of freedom, this ratio was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of the two classes as rated by the teachers was retained since the obtained difference was insignificant.

The standard error of the difference between the two means of the upper-middle and upper-lower classes was 10.75. The critical ratio, 1.52, was found to be significant at the .50 level of confidence. Here again, the null hypothesis was retained and the difference considered insignificant.

The hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of the ratings given the upper-middle and lower-lower class subjects by the teachers was rejected since the standard error of the difference between the two means was 12.60. The critical ratio was 2.60, which is significant at the .02 level of confidence.

The standard error of the difference between the means of the ratings given the lower-middle and upper-lower class subjects by their teachers was 11.54. The critical ratio was .01 and was not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted on the assumption that chance factors were operating.

The standard error of the difference between the means of the lower-middle and lower-lower class subjects was 4.38. The test for significance indicated that the obtained difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and the obtained difference considered very significant.

The standard error of the difference between the means of the upper-lower and lower-lower class was 11.82. The

critical ratio, 1.39, was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of the upper-lower and lower-lower classes was retained since the obtained differences between the two samples were considered to be due to chance.

Self-Ratings.— The distribution of the frequencies of self-ratings by the subjects on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule is shown in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22 on pages 41, 42, 43, and 44, respectively.

According to Table 19, the upper-middle class subjects rated bullying as their major behavior problem. The other problems, in the order of rating, were: unpopularity with other children, temper outbursts, obscene notes, talk or pictures, lying, marked overactivity, and unnecessary tardiness.

The lower-middle class subjects rated bullying as their leading behavior problem. The other problems given were: temper outbursts, obscene notes, talk, or pictures, unpopularity with children, marked overactivity, lying, unnecessary tardiness, cheating, stealing, and defiance of discipline.

The upper-lower class subjects also listed bullying as their major behavior problem. The following problems were listed in the order of their rating by the subjects: temper outbursts, lying, obscene notes, talk, or pictures, unnecessary tardiness, marked overactivity, cheating, unpopular with children, and speech difficulties.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SELF-RATINGS MADE BY THE SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	8				0	-
Cheating	8				0	-
Unnecessary Tardiness	5	3			12	7
Lying	4	4			16	5.5
Defiance of Discipline	8				0	-
Marked Overactivity	6	2			16	5.5
Unpopular with Children	5	3			24	3
Temper Outbursts	5	3			24	3
Bullying	2	6			48	1
Speech Difficulties	8				0	-
Sex Offenses	8				0	-
Stealing	8				0	-
Truancy	8				0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	6	2			24	3
Total Score					164	

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SELF-RATINGS MADE BY THE SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS
ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULES

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	13				0	-
Cheating	9	3		1	19	8
Unnecessary Tardiness	6	6	1		30	7
Lying	5	8			32	6
Defiance of Discipline	12		1		6	10
Marked Overactivity	8	5			40	5
Unpopular with Children	8	4	1		44	4
Temper Outbursts	7	5		1	54	2
Bullying	6	7			56	1
Speech Difficulties	13				0	-
Sex Offenses	13				0	-
Stealing	12	1			12	9
Truancy	13				0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	9	4			48	3
Total Score					341	

TABLE 21

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SELF-RATINGS MADE BY THE SUBJECTS IN THE UPPER-LOWER CLASS
ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE				Score	Rank
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently		
Disinterest in School Work	17				0	-
Cheating	15	2			8	8
Unnecessary Tardiness	9	5	2	1	39	5
Lying	4	13			52	2
Defiance of Discipline	17				0	-
Marked Overactivity	14	3			24	6
Unpopular with Children	16	1			8	8
Temper Outbursts	7	9	1		84	2
Bullying	6	9	2		96	1
Speech Difficulties	16	1			8	8
Sex Offenses	17				0	-
Stealing	17				0	-
Truancy	17				0	-
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	13	4			48	4
Total Score					367	

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF SELF-RATINGS MADE BY THE SUBJECTS IN THE LOWER-LOWER CLASS
ON THE HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE					
	Never	Once or Twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	11				0	-
Cheating	9	1		1	11	10
Unnecessary Tardiness	4	7			28	6
Lying	1	8	2		44	4
Defiance of Discipline	11				0	-
Marked Overactivity	9	2			16	7
Unpopular with Children	10	1			8	11
Temper Outbursts	3	5	2	1	78	2
Bullying	2	7	2	1	80	1
Speech Difficulties	11				0	-
Sex Offenses	8	3			36	5
Stealing	10	1			12	8.5
Truancy	10	1			12	8.5
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	7	4			48	3
Total Score					373	

Table 22 on page 44 shows that bullying was rated as the leading behavior problem by the lower-lower class. The other problems, in the order of rating, were: temper outbursts, obscene notes, talk or pictures, lying, sex-offenses, unnecessary tardiness, marked overactivity, stealing, truancy, cheating, and unpopular with children.

Table 23 shows the distribution of self-ratings of behavior problems in the various social classes .

TABLE 23
DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-RATINGS BY SUBJECTS IN THE
FIVE SOCIAL CLASSES ON THE HAGGERTY-
OLSON-WICKMAN BEHAVIOR RATING
SCHEDULE

SC	No.	Range	Mean	Median
U	1	50 -	50.00	50.00
UM	8	8 - 48	20.50	18.00
LM	13	8 - 52	26.23	24.00
UL	17	0 - 46	21.58	23.00
LL	11	8 - 70	33.91	32.00

The widest range of scores and the highest average scores were in the lower-lower class. The upper-middle class had the lowest scores. The range of scores in the upper-middle and upper-lower classes was practically the same.

Tables 24, 25, and 26 on pages 47, 48, and 49, respectively, are presented to summarize the scores and ranks of the behavior problems according to social class groupings. Table 24 presents the distribution of total scores and ranks or ratings by the teachers on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A. Table 25 gives the distribution of the total scores and ranks of self-ratings on the scale. Table 26 presents a summary of the rank order of behavior problems as rated by the best friends, least-liked acquaintances, teachers and the self-ratings of the subjects on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule.

Stogdill Behavior Cards.-- The behavior problems revealed by the Stogdill Behavior Cards, according to the "yes" responses, indicate that the kinds of deviations in behavior that occur during pre- and early adolescence.

The author computed the standard error of the frequency to determine if chance was operating in the responses given by the subjects. The standard error of the frequency was $75\sqrt{6.12}$. Between 68.88 and 81.12 it is assumed that chance might have been operating. Therefore, all scores which fall above 81 and below 69 are considered fairly reliable scores. According to Table 27, the highest score obtained was 71 and the lowest was 1. Only in one

TABLE 24

DISTRIBUTION OF THE TOTAL SCORES ON THE BEHAVIOR SCALE AS RATED BY THE TEACHER
ACCORDING TO SOCIAL GROUPINGS

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	U M		L M		U L		L L	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	31	2	43	2	51	4	44	5.5
Cheating	0	-	10	12	12	12	18	10
Unnecessary Tardiness	0	-	8	13	36	6	30	8
Lying	6	6	13	9	30	8.5	16	11
Defiance of Discipline	7	5	11	11	28	10	33	7
Marked Overactivity	32	1	92	1	30	8.5	56	4
Unpopular with Children	16	3	40	3.5	66	2	70	3
Temper Outbursts	0	-	22	6	66	2	76	1
Bullying	0	-	40	3.5	40	5	44	5.5
Speech Difficulties	8	4	38	5	32	7	28	9
Sex Offenses	0	-	12	10	12	12	0	-
Stealing	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Truancy	0	-	18	7.5	12	12	12	12
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	0	-	18	7.5	66	2	72	2
Totals	100		365		481		499	

TABLE 25

DISTRIBUTION OF THE TOTAL SCORES IN THE SELF-RATINGS ACCORDING
TO SOCIAL CLASS GROUPINGS

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	U M		L M		U L		L L	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Disinterest in School Work	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Cheating	0	-	19	8	8	8	11	10
Unnecessary Tardiness	12	7	30	7	39	5	28	6
Lying	16	5.5	32	6	52	3	44	4
Defiance of Discipline	0	-	6	10	0	-	0	-
Marked Overactivity	16	5.5	40	5	24	6	16	7
Unpopular with Children	24	3	44	4	8	8	8	11
Temper Outbursts	24	3	54	2	84	2	78	2
Bullying	48	1	56	1	96	1	80	1
Speech Difficulties	0	-	0	-	8	8	0	-
Sex Offenses	0	-	0	-	0	-	36	5
Stealing	0	-	12	9	0	-	12	8.5
Truancy	0	-	0	-	0	-	12	8.5
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	24	3	48	3	48	4	48	3
Totals	164		341		367		373	

TABLE 26

ORDER OF SUBJECT BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS' RATINGS BY BEST FRIEND, LEAST-LIKED
ACQUAINTANCE, TEACHER AND SELF

BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS	U M				L M				U L				L L			
	BF	LLA	TCHRS	SELF	BF	LLA	TCHRS	SELF	BF	LLA	TCHRS	SELF	BF	LLA	TCHRS	SELF
Disinterest in School	-	6	2	-	10.5	10	2	-	10	10	4	-	-	11	5.5	-
Work	6	9	-	-	10.5	7	12	8	8	7	12	8	8	8	10	10
Cheating	2	3	-	7	5	4	13	7	2	3	6	5	6	3.5	8	6
Unnecessary Tardiness	3.5	5	6	5.5	6	5.5	9	6	5	4	8.5	3	7	5	11	4
Lying	-	8	5	-	8	-	11	10	11	8	10	-	9	9	7	-
Defiance of Discipline	6	-	1	5.5	7	8	1	5	4	5	8.5	6	10.5	6.5	4	7
Marked Overactivity	6	2	3	3	4	3	3.5	4	6	10	2	8	5	6.5	3	11
Unpopular with Children	3.5	1	-	3	2	1	6	2	1	2	2	2	2	3.5	1	2
Temper Outbursts	1	4	-	1	1	2	3.5	1	3	1	5	1	1	2	5.5	1
Bullying	-	-	4	-	-	11	5	-	9	10	7	8	10.5	-	9	-
Speech Difficulties	-	-	-	-	-	9	10	-	12.5	-	12	-	4	-	-	5
Sex Offenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	12.5	-	-	-	-	10	-	8.5
Stealing	-	-	-	-	9	-	7.5	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	12	8.5
Truancy	-	7	-	-	3	5.5	7.5	3	7	6	2	4	3	1	2	3
Obscene Notes, Talk or Pictures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

case, 71, was chance considered operative. The other scores are said to be true indices of the behavior problems manifested by the subjects. Table 27 gives the distribution of "yes" responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards according to the social class groupings.

TABLE 27

DISTRIBUTION OF "YES" RESPONSES TO THE STOGDILL
BEHAVIOR CARDS BY THE FIFTY SUBJECTS

SC	No.	Range	Mean	Median
U	1	26 -	26.00	26.00
UM	8	1 - 24	8.75	7.50
LM	13	1 - 47	11.77	5.00
UL	17	3 - 39	15.24	12.00
LL	11	5 - 71	26.91	21.00

Table 27 shows that the range of scores in the upper-middle class was from 1 to 24. The mean was 8.75 and the median 7.50. The lower-middle class responded to as many as 47 of the items with a mean score of 11.77 and a median of 5.00. The "yes" responses of the upper-lower class ranged from 3 to 39. The mean was 15.24 and the median 12.00. The responses of the lower-lower class ranged from 5 to 71. The mean was 26.91 and the median 21.00.

The reliability of the difference between the mean scores obtained by the subjects from the various classes is shown in Table 28. The hypothesis tested was that there is no significant difference between the mean scores obtained by the subjects in the various class groupings compared.

TABLE 28

THE RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OBTAINED BY THE SUBJECTS ON THE STODGILL
BEHAVIOR CARDS

SC	No.	Mean	s	SEd	t	Level
UM LM	8 13	8.75 11.77	12.66	5.67	.53	—
UM UL	8 17	8.75 15.24	9.35	4.01	1.62	.50
UM LL	8 11	8.75 29.91	15.30	7.11	2.98	.01
LM UL	13 17	11.77 15.24	12.35	4.56	.76	.50
LM LL	13 11	11.77 26.91	16.95	6.95	2.17	.05
UL LL	17 11	15.24 26.91	14.27	5.56	2.10	.05

The standard error of the difference between the means of the upper-middle and lower-middle classes was 5.67.

The t test for significance indicated that this difference was not significant and the null hypothesis was accordingly retained.

The standard error of the difference between the upper-middle and upper-lower class subjects was 4.01. The critical ratio, 1.62, was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered due to chance factors and the null hypothesis was retained.

The hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of the upper-middle and lower-lower classes on the Stogdill Behavior Cards was rejected at the .01 level of confidence. The standard error of the difference between the means was 7.11. The test for significance indicated that the obtained difference was very significant.

The standard error of the difference between the lower-middle and upper-lower classes was 4.56. The critical ratio was found to be .76 and was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The obtained frequency difference was considered insignificant and the null hypothesis was accordingly retained.

The standard error of the difference between the lower-middle and lower-lower class was 6.95. The critical ratio was 2.17. The obtained difference was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence and on this basis the null hypothesis was rejected.

The standard error of the difference between the means of the upper-lower and lower-lower classes was 5.56. The critical ratio, 2.10, was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered significant and the null hypothesis was considered untenable.

The writer computed the percentage of "yes" responses in each social class for the eighteen major classes of behavior problems indicated by the Stogdill Behavior Cards. These scores were obtained by totaling the total possible responses for each item and multiplying this number by the frequency in each class and calculating the respective percentages.

Table 29 shows the percentages and rank of "yes" responses by the subjects to the Stogdill Behavior Cards according to social classes.

The tendency to tell lies was indicated as the major behavior problem in all the social classes.

The upper-middle class subjects reacted to 15 per cent of the items dealing with lies. The percentages for the lower-middle class was 23 per cent, the upper-lower was 25 per cent and the lower-lower, 39 per cent.

The other behavior problems are listed according to the percentages and rank of "yes" responses from each social class.

The upper-middle class subjects considered lying to be their greatest behavior problem and gave no "yes" responses

TABLE 29

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PER CENT OF "YES" RESPONSES AND THE RANK OF THE PERCENTAGES ON
THE STOGDILL BEHAVIOR CARDS

Behavior Problems	Upper-Middle		Lower-Middle		Upper-Lower		Lower-Lower	
	Per Cent of "Yes" Responses	Rank of Per Cent	Per Cent of "Yes" Responses	Rank of Per Cent	Per Cent of "Yes" Responses	Rank of Per Cent	Per Cent of "Yes" Responses	Rank of Per Cent
Feels picked on	14	2	11	4	18	3	28	2
Anger, disobedience	7	6	5	10	8	9	19	6.5
School difficulties	6	7	10	5.5	9	7.5	25	3
Stays away from home	1	12	2	14	3	12.5	14	12.5
Truancy from school	-	15.5	2	14	-	17.5	14	12.5
Lies	15	1	23	1	25	1	39	1
Stealing	-	15.5	3	12	1	15	12	4
Fights, aggression	4	10	8	8	9	7.5	15	11
Inadequate companions	12	3	10	5.5	20	2	21	4
Delinquent Companions	5	8.5	13	2	16	4	17	10
Obscenity	8	5	5	10	4	11	5	17
Sex experience	2	11	5	10	1	15	11	15
In court	-	15.5	-	17	3	12.5	4	18
Robbery	-	15.5	-	17	-	17.5	18	8.5
Smokes, drinks	-	15.5	2	14	1	15	20	5
Set fires	-	15.5	-	17	6	10	9	16
Fears, worries	11	4	12	3	14	5	19	6.5
Home unsatisfactory	5	8.5	9	7	13	6	18	8.5

to truancy from school, stealing, being in court, robbery, smoking, drinking, and setting things afire. Such problems as feeling picked on, inadequate companions, fears, worries, obscenity, anger, disobedience, school difficulties, delinquent companions, home unsatisfactory, fights, aggressions, sex experiences and staying away from home were also listed, in that order.

Likewise, the lower-middle class subjects placed lying as their greatest behavior problem and did not respond to robbery, set fires, and being in court. They listed, in order of rank, delinquent companions, fears, worries, feels picked on, school difficulties, inadequate companions, home unsatisfactory, fights, aggression, anger, disobedience, obscenity, sex experience, stealing, staying away from home, truancy from school, and smokes, drinks.

The upper-lower class, in like manner, indicated that lying was the greatest behavior problem of this class. They did not indicate a "yes" response for truancy from school and robbery. Inadequate companions, feeling picked on, delinquent companions, fears, worries, home unsatisfactory, school difficulties, fights, aggression, anger, disobedience, set fires, obscenity, sex experiences, and smokes, drinks were listed in the order in which the "yes" responses were given by the subjects.

In the lower-lower class, the largest percentage of total responses was to telling lies. Unlike the other

classes, the lower-lower class subjects responded to all items which would seem to indicate that all of the major problems which are derived from the Stogdill Behavior Cards have been, to some extent, manifested by lower-lower class children. In order of rank, the following problems were indicated by the lower-lower class children: feeling picked on, school difficulties, inadequate companions, smokes, drinks, anger, disobedience, fears, worries, fighting, aggressions, truancy from school, staying away from home, stealing, sex experiences, setting of fires, and obscenity.

The one upper-class subject's responses are cited for descriptive purposes only. Robbery was listed as the first major problem and no responses were given to truancy from school, stealing, sex experiences, being in court, smoking, drinking, and setting fires. Telling lies, anger, disobedience, obscenity, inadequate companions, delinquent companions, staying away from home, fights, aggression, and home unsatisfactory, were listed as problems in this order by the subject.

Comparison of Ratings and Stogdill Behavior Cards.--
The writer computed rho to test the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between ratings by best friends and self-ratings on the Haggerty-Olson Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule. The coefficients of correlation for the various social class groupings are given in Table 30.

TABLE 30

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SELF-RATINGS
AND THE RATINGS MADE BY THE BEST FRIENDS
ON THE BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

SC	N	df (N-1)	Rho	Level of Significance
UM	8	6	.36	Insignificant
LM	13	11	.45	Insignificant
UL	17	15	.38	Insignificant
LL	11	9	.30	Insignificant

For all of the social classes, rho was found to be insignificant. In the upper-lower and lower-middle classes, the coefficients approached significance at the .05 level. Since the test for significance indicated that the obtained coefficients were very likely due to chance and the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 31 shows the coefficients of correlation between the self-ratings and the ratings of the least-liked acquaintances.

TABLE 31

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SELF-RATINGS
AND THE RATINGS MADE BY THE LEAST-LIKED AC-
QUAINTANCES ON THE BEHAVIOR SCALE

SC	N	df (N-1)	Rho	Level of Significance
UM	8	6	.43	Insignificant
LM	13	11	.17	Insignificant
UL	17	15	.13	Insignificant
LL	11	9	.31	Insignificant

The test for significance of rho for each class grouping indicated that none were significant, therefore, the obtained coefficients were attributed to chance factors. The hypothesis that there is no relationship between the self-ratings and the ratings made by the least-liked acquaintances was retained as a result.

The writer also assumed that there was no relationship between the self-ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule and the scores on the Stogdill Behavior Cards. Table 32 shows the coefficients of correlation for these data distributions.

TABLE 32

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN SCORES MADE
BY THE SUBJECTS ON THE STOGDILL BEHAVIOR
CARDS AND THE SELF-RATINGS ON THE
BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE

SC	N	df (N - 1)	Rho	Level of Significance
UM	8	6	.52	Not Significant
LM	13	11	.56	Significant
UL	17	15	-.07	Not Significant
LL	11	9	.47	Not Significant

For the upper-middle class, rho was found to be .52. The test for significance indicated that the obtained coefficient was not significant. In the lower-middle class, rho was .56 and found to be significant at the

.05 level of confidence. A negative coefficient of $-.07$ was obtained in the upper-lower class and the test for significance indicated that the estimated coefficient was not significant. In like manner, the value for lower-lower class ρ was $.47$ and the test for significance indicated that the estimated coefficient was probably due to chance.

The writer, therefore, was able to accept the relevant null hypothesis for the upper-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower classes but rejected the null hypothesis for the lower-middle class. That is, there is a significant relationship between the scores made by these subjects on the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the self-ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule only in the lower-middle class.

Sex Differences.-- This section of the chapter will deal specifically with the sex differences in behavior problems as are indicated by the "yes" responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the ratings given the subjects on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A. The difference between the means of the middle classes and the lower classes will be compared for significance.

The distribution of the frequencies of "yes" responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards according to sex is shown in Table 33.

TABLE 33

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FREQUENCIES OF "YES" RESPONSES
TO THE STOGDILL BEHAVIOR CARDS ACCORDING TO
THE SEX OF THE SUBJECTS

SC	Number		Range		Mean		Median	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
UM	5	3	6-24	1-19	10.60	5.67	8.00	7.00
LM	7	6	2-47	1-11	17.28	5.33	8.00	4.00
UL	7	10	7-39	3-23	19.43	12.30	14.00	11.00
LL	9	2	15-71	5-	31.78	5.00	29.00	5.00

The responses for the boys ranged from 2 to 71, whereas the responses for the girls ranged from 1 to 23. The means of the sample for the girls were approximately the same in the upper-middle, lower-middle, and lower-lower classes. The means of these classes ranged between 5.00 and 5.67, but in the upper-lower class the mean was 12.30. The mean for the boys ranged from 10.60 to 31.78 with a fairly consistent increment between the classes.

Since this distribution of mean scores were almost equally distributed, the significance of the difference between the means of the two middle classes grouped together, and the two lower classes grouped together for each sex was computed. The hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the mean scores obtained by the subjects in the middle class and the lower class for each sex. This reliability of the difference is

shown in Table 34.

TABLE 34

THE RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OF THE MIDDLE AND LOWER SOCIAL CLASSES WITHIN
EACH SEX GROUP ON THE STOGDILL CARDS

Social Classes	No.	Mean	s	SED	t	Level
BOYS						
Middle	12	14.50	15.40	5.85	2.01	.10
Lower	16	26.25				
GIRLS						
Middle	9	5.44	5.77	1.84	3.06	.01
Lower	12	11.08				

The mean of the middle class for the boys was 14.50 and 26.25 for the lower class. The standard error of the difference between the means was 5.85. The t test for significance indicated that this difference was significant only at the .10 level of confidence; the null hypothesis was retained accordingly. The means of the scores made by the girls in the middle class was 5.44 and 11.08 in the lower class. The standard error of the difference between the two means was 5.77. The critical ratio was 3.06 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The null hypothesis was rejected and the obtained difference was considered a result of a factor or factors other than chance.

Table 35 shows the distribution of self-ratings made by the boys and girls on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman

Behavior Rating Schedules: Schedule A.

TABLE 35
DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-RATINGS ACCORDING TO SEX

SC	Number		Range		Mean		Median	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
UM	5	3	12-48	8-24	21.60	18.67	16.00	24.00
LM	7	6	8-52	8-28	32.14	18.33	28.00	20.00
UL	7	10	8-46	0-36	27.86	17.20	28.00	14.00
LL	9	2	16-70	8-22	38.11	15.00	38.00	15.00

The range of ratings for the boys was between 8 and 70 and for the girls, 0 and 36. There was a wider range of ratings in the lower-lower class for boys and in the upper-lower class for girls. In the upper-middle and upper-lower class the boys and girls rated themselves lower on the scale than the lower-middle and lower-lower class subjects. This trend is shown in the pattern which the means follow in the distribution.

The reliability of the difference between the means of the middle classes and of the lower classes for each sex is shown in Table 36. The hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the means obtained by the subjects in the middle class and lower class for each sex.

TABLE 36

THE RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OF THE MIDDLE AND LOWER SOCIAL CLASSES
FOR EACH SEX GROUP

BOYS						
Social Classes	No.	Mean	s	SE _D	t	Level
Middle	12	27.75	12.58	4.77	1.23	.50
Lower	16	33.62				
GIRLS						
Middle	9	19.11	8.85	2.83	.80	.50
Lower	12	16.83				

The standard error of the difference between the means for the boys was 2.77. The critical ratio was 1.53 and was significant at the .50 level of confidence. This obtained difference was considered insignificant and the null hypothesis retained.

The standard error of the difference between the means for the girls was 2.83. The test for significance indicated that this difference was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The writer considered this difference due to chance factors and retained the null hypothesis.

A qualitative analysis of the scores revealed that in the upper-middle class the boys listed bullying as the major behavior problem. The other problems, in order of rating for the boys, were: obscenity, unpopularity with children, lying, unnecessary tardiness, marked overactivity,

and temper outbursts. In like manner, the girls in the upper-middle class listed bullying as the major behavior problem. The other problems the girls listed were: marked overactivity, unpopularity with children, temper outbursts, lying and defiance of discipline. In the lower-middle class, the boys rated obscenity as being their leading behavior problem. The other problems, in the order of rating, were: temper outbursts, bullying, marked overactivity, lying, unnecessary tardiness, unpopularity with children, stealing and cheating. The girls considered unpopularity with other children as their major behavior problem. The other problems rated were: bullying, marked overactivity, unnecessary tardiness, lying, cheating, temper outbursts, and defiance of discipline.

The upper-lower class boys listed bullying as their major behavior problem. The other problems were: temper outbursts, unnecessary tardiness, lying, obscenity, cheating, marked overactivity, and speech difficulties. The major behavior problem of the girls in the upper-lower class was temper outbursts. Bullying, lying, obscenity, marked overactivity, unpopularity with other children, unnecessary tardiness, and defiance of discipline were also listed as behavior problems by the upper-lower class girls.

In the lower-lower class, bullying was rated by the boys as being their major behavior problem. The other problems given were: temper outbursts, obscenity, lying, sex offenses, unnecessary tardiness, stealing, truancy, cheating, marked overactivity, and unpopularity with children. The two girls in the lower-lower class rated marked overactivity, temper outbursts, and bullying as their major behavior problems. Lying was also listed as a behavior problem by the lower-lower class girls.

The distribution of the frequencies of the teachers' ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule according to sex is shown in Table 37.

TABLE 37

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RATINGS BY HOMEROOM TEACHERS
ON THE BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULE ACCORDING
TO THE SEX OF THE SUBJECT

SC	Number		Range		Mean		Median	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
UM	5	3	4-16	8-43	9.00	18.33	7.00	8.00
LM	7	6	8-99	0-42	41.00	13.33	19.00	8.00
UL	7	10	0-100	0-78	33.57	24.60	20.00	21.00
LL	9	2	0-81	32-38	47.67	35.00	66.00	35.00

The range of the ratings for the boys was between 0 and 100 and the range for the girls was between 0 and 78. The highest range for both boys and girls was in the

upper-lower class.

Table 38 shows the reliability of the difference between the means of the ratings by teachers according to sex and middle and lower class status. The hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the mean ratings given the middle class and lower class boys and girls by the teachers.

TABLE 38

RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE
MEANS OF THE MIDDLE AND THE LOWER
CLASSES AS RATED BY THE
HOMEROOM TEACHERS

Social Classes	No.	Mean	s	SE _D	t	Level
BOYS						
Middle	12	27.66	34.70	13.19	1.05	.50
Lower	16	41.50				
GIRLS						
Middle	9	15.00	19.50	6.24	1.82	.10
Lower	12	26.33				

The standard error of the difference between the means of the middle class and lower class boys was 13.19. The critical ratio, 1.05, was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered to be due to chance factors and the null hypothesis was retained.

The standard error of the difference between the means

of the middle class and lower class girls was 6.24. The t test of significance indicated that this difference was significant at the .10 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered a result of chance factors and the null hypothesis was retained.

The distribution of the frequencies for the ratings of the boys and girls by their best friends is shown in Table 39.

TABLE 39
DISTRIBUTION OF THE BEHAVIOR RATINGS BY THE
BEST FRIENDS ACCORDING TO THE
SEX OF THE SUBJECTS

SC	Number		Range		Mean		Median	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
UM	5	3	8-28	0-18	16.00	7.33	16.00	4.00
LM	7	6	12-75	4-40	39.14	18.33	36.00	17.00
UL	7	10	11-62	12-72	28.00	25.20	26.00	16.50
LL	9	2	4-62	16-	30.33	16.00	24.00	16.00

The range of scores for the boys was from 4 to 75 and for the girls 0 to 72. The means for the boys ranged from 16.00 to 39.14 and for the girls between 7.33 and 25.20.

The reliability of the difference between the means of the middle and lower social class groupings for both sexes is shown in Table 40.

TABLE 40

RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF
MIDDLE AND LOWER CLASS BOYS AND GIRLS AS
RATED BY BEST FRIENDS

Social Classes	No.	Mean	s	SE _D	t	Level
BOYS						
Middle	12	29.25	19.30	7.33	.026	--
Lower	16	29.31				
GIRLS						
Middle	9	14.67	15.60	4.99	1.80	.10
Lower	12	23.67				

The standard error of the difference between the means of the middle class and lower class boys was 7.33. The critical ratio of .026 was not significant. The hypothesis that there is no difference between the means made by the boys in the middle class and lower class was accordingly retained. The standard error of the difference between the means of the middle class and lower class girls was 15.60. The t test for significance indicated that this difference was significant at the .10 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered a result of chance factors and the relevant null hypothesis was retained.

The distribution of the frequencies of the ratings by the least-liked acquaintances on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule according to sex is shown in Table 41.

TABLE 41

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RATINGS BY THE LEAST-LIKED
ACQUAINTANCES ACCORDING TO THE SEX
OF THE SUBJECT

SC	Number		Range		Mean		Median	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
UM	5	3	8-42	4-32	25.20	17.33	24.00	16.00
LM	7	6	0-62	4-22	31.57	14.33	34.00	16.00
UL	7	10	12-42	0-37	21.86	22.10	22.00	22.00
LL	9	2	0-60	12-24	34.44	21.86	40.00	22.00

The range of scores for boys was from 0 to 62 and for girls from 0 to 37. The means for the boys ranged from 21.86 to 34.44. The means for the girls ranged from 14.33 to 22.10. The mean scores indicate that there were a greater number of behavior problems in the lower-lower class for both the boys and girls as rated by the least-liked acquaintances. However, the mean of the upper-lower class girls was 22.10 and for the lower-lower class girls 21.86, but the medians were exactly the same. It may also be noted that the mean for the upper-lower class boys was identical with the mean of the lower-lower class girls.

The reliability of the difference between the means of the middle and lower social classes for both sexes as rated by the least-liked acquaintances is shown in Table 42.

TABLE 42

RELIABILITY OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEANS
OF THE MIDDLE AND LOWER CLASS BOYS AND
GIRLS AS RATED BY THE LEAST-
LIKED ACQUAINTANCES

Social Classes	No.	Mean	s	SE _D	t	Level
BOYS						
Middle	12	28.92	19.01	7.22	.86	.50
Lower	16	22.68				
GIRLS						
Middle	9	15.33	10.50	3.36	1.81	.10
Lower	12	21.42				

The standard error of the difference between the means of the middle class and lower class boys was 7.22. The critical ratio, .86, was significant at the .50 level of confidence. The obtained difference was considered due to chance factors and the null hypothesis retained.

The standard error of the difference between the means of the middle class and lower class girls was 3.36. The t test for significance indicated that this difference was significant at the .10 level of confidence. The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the means of the middle and lower social class groupings as rated by the least-liked friends was retained for both the boys and the girls.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

Conclusions Growing Out of Analysis.-- The conclusions formulated in this chapter are made in the light of the hypothesis set up for this study, the assumptions, and limitations as to the materials and methods.

The evidence of this study reveals that behavior problems exist to some degree in all social classes, and, to some extent, occur more frequently in the lower classes. There is, however, a tendency for the type of problem to be related to the social class of the individual who is manifesting the problem.

First, the evidence of this study reveals that best friends of lower-middle, upper-lower and lower-lower class children tend to rate subjects higher than the best friends of the upper-middle class children with reference to the number of behavior problems.

- a. The best friends rated bullying as the leading behavior problem of the subjects in all social classes except the lower-lower class. In the lower-lower class, temper outbursts was rated by the best friends as the major behavior problem.
- b. The lower-lower class subjects were rated by their

best friends as having more "severe" behavior problems than members of the other social classes. To what extent this result may be inherent in the behavior rating scales themselves is unknown. Middle class investigators and practitioners have traditionally tended to classify particularly lower-lower class behavior as "delinquent" or as problem behavior, as the passage quoted from Shaeffer in Chapter I has hinted.

Second, the least-liked acquaintances tend to rate the lower-lower class subjects as having a greater number of behavior problems than the subjects in the other social classes.

- a. Unpopularity with other children, temper outbursts, bullying and obscenity were rated by the least-liked acquaintances of the subjects as the major behavior problems for these upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower class Negro subjects, respectively.
- b. Unlike the ratings made by the best friends, the least-liked acquaintances did not rate the lower-lower class subjects as having very "severe" behavior problems. The circumstance that the least-liked persons were themselves members of the lower-lower class tends to corroborate that what is considered a problem by one class is not so

seen by the members of the social group being observed.

Third, since the selection of best friends and least-liked acquaintances was not found to be related to class factors, there was no significant relationship between the ratings made by the best friends and the least-liked acquaintances in the upper-lower and lower-lower social classes. There was, however, a very significant relationship between these two ratings in the upper-middle class and a significant relationship in the lower-middle class.

Fourth, the analysis shows that as the social class of the subjects moves downward on the social scale, there is a tendency for the number of behavior problems to increase, as rated by the teachers. This result coincides with the findings of Davis,¹ Warner² and others, on the tendency of middle class teachers to rate children against the behavior expected of middle class children and in light of the standards and values of this class.

- a. Specifically, there was a very significant difference between the means of the ratings made by the teachers for the lower-middle and lower-lower class subjects. In like manner, there was

¹ Allison Davis, Social Class Influence Upon Learning (Cambridge, 1949).

² W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated? (New York, 1944).

a significant difference between the means of the upper-middle and the lower-lower classes as rated by the teachers.

Fifth, the lower-lower class subjects rated themselves as having more behavior problems than the other classes. The upper-middle class subjects rated themselves as having fewer behavior problems than members of the other social classes. The possibility that these results may be a function of the rating scales themselves has already been mentioned.

- a. Bullying was rated as the major behavior problem by the subjects themselves in all of the social classes.

Sixth, considering the order of subject's behavior problem ratings by best friend, teacher, least-liked acquaintance and self, bullying was rated as the major problem (eight times out of a possible sixteen) in all of the social classes. The behavior problem with the second highest frequency in all the classes was temper outbursts.

Seventh, and similar to the results of the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule, as the social class of the subjects moves downward on the social class scale, there is a tendency for the percentage of "yes" responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards to move upward.

- a. According to the scores on the Stogdill Behavior Cards, telling lies was responded to more frequently than any of the other problems in all classes.

- b. The lower-lower class subjects responded to all items which again raises the question as to whether the test itself may be playing a role in contributing to these results.

Eighth, no significant relationship was found between the self-ratings and the ratings made by the best friends and/or the least-liked acquaintances.

- a. No significant relationship was found between the self-ratings and the scores made by the subjects on the Stogdill Behavior Cards in the upper-middle, upper-lower, and the lower-lower classes. There was, however, a significant relationship between the scores made by the lower-middle class subjects on the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the self-ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A.

Ninth, the range of scores on the Stogdill Behavior Cards for the boys was from 6 to 71 and for the girls from 1 to 23.

- a. The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the scores made by the boys from the middle and lower classes on the Stogdill Behavior Cards was significant at the .10 level of confidence. This difference was considered insignificant and the null hypothesis retained accordingly.

- b. The same hypothesis using the girls as subjects was significant at the .01 level of confidence. This difference was considered significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The difference in the mean scores of the middle and lower class girls hence cannot be attributed to chance. The variable of social class status can be assumed to be closely related to this difference. This result also indicates that the lower class girls have a significantly greater number of behavior problems than the middle class girls as measured by the Stogdill Behavior Cards.

Tenth, the range of scores for the boys on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule was from 8 to 70 and the girls from 0 to 36.

- a. Both the boys and the girls in the upper-middle and upper-lower classes rated themselves lower on the scale than the lower-middle and lower-lower class boys and girls.
- b. The hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the means obtained by the boys in the middle class and lower class on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule. The test for significance indicated that the obtained difference was significant at the .50 level of confidence. This difference was

considered due to chance factors and the null hypothesis was retained.

- b. The same hypothesis using the girls as subjects was considered insignificant at the .50 level of confidence. In like manner, this difference was concluded to be a result of chance factors and the null hypothesis was retained.

Eleventh, bullying was rated as the major problem on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule by the boys from all social class groupings. For the girls, bullying, unpopularity with peers, temper outbursts, and marked overactivity were listed as the major behavior problems in the upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower classes respectively.

Twelfth, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings given middle-class and lower class boys and girls by the teachers was found to be significant at the .50 level for the boys and the .10 level for the girls. The null hypothesis was accordingly retained for each group.

Thirteenth, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings given the boys and the girls of the middle and the lower class groupings by their best friends was found to be significant at the .10 level for the girls and below the .50 level for the boys. The null hypothesis was retained for each grouping.

Fourteenth, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the mean ratings given the boys and the girls of the middle and the lower class groupings by their least-liked acquaintances was found to be significant at the .50 level of confidence for the boys and the .10 level for the girls. The null hypothesis was accordingly retained.

Fifteenth, and finally, the major hypothesis of this thesis that there is a wide range of behavior problems in each class and that these behavior problems vary in each class qualitatively rather than quantitatively, as measured by the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A, has on the whole been supported in light of the foregoing conclusions.

Relationship of Conclusions to Previous Findings.--
Contradictory to Neugarten's¹ findings, the writer concluded that for this sample of Negro children aged 11 to 15, there is not a tendency for the children to select their best friends from within their own social class. The results in this study may be due to the large proportion of upper-lower class children in the schools, thereby providing a wider range for selection of friends in this class by members in all of the classes. This thesis supports, for this study sample, Neugarten's

¹Bernice Neugarten, op. cit.

contention that there is a tendency for lower class children to be selected more often as least-liked acquaintances than to be selected as best friends.

Shaw¹ in his study of delinquency recognized social environment as a factor in delinquency. This study recognized environmental factors as playing a specific role in such behavior problems as obscenity, stealing, sex offenses, truancy and other behavior problems not considered "mild."

Hollingshead,² in a study of 735 boys and girls in a small midwestern town, found that the social status of parents was a determining factor in the type of behavior expressed by their offspring. This belief coincides with the general conclusion derived from this study that there is a tendency for the type of behavior problem manifested by the children to also vary in accordance with the social class of the children. Milner³ supports this belief in her statement that "when a person has social training experiences closely similar to those of another, they will develop similar personality characteristics." This statement is based on her study of 30 early-adolescent boys and girls of the lower-middle and the upper-lower social classes.

The findings of this study also support the following

¹ Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency (Washington, D. C., 1931).

² A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York, 1949).

³ Esther Milner, "Effects of Sex Role and Social Status on the Early Adolescent Personality." Genetic Psychology Monographs, XL (1949), 231-325.

statement given by Wickman:

Teachers' reactions to the behavior of children are largely determined by the direct effect which the behavior produces on the teachers themselves. In so far as the behavior attacks the teachers' moral sensitivities, personal integrity, authority, and immediate teaching purposes, it becomes recognized as a problem behavior; in so far as behavior is agreeable to teachers, respects their authority, fits in with their teaching purposes as well as their ethical beliefs, it is considered desirable behavior.¹

These studies also illustrate aspects of behavior which appear to have some measure of relationship with social class factors.

Recommendations for Further Study.--- In summarizing the findings of this study, the writer realized that many areas have not been covered fully. There is, indeed, a need for further research in this area since the literature related to it is very limited.

Studies comparing the behavior problems manifested by Negro and white children of the same social class might throw light on the nature of the differences which exist in their living environments.

In order to get a detailed picture of all social classes and the behavior problems characteristic of each, the writer recommends that separate studies be made of each social class and the results compared.

¹
E. K. Wickman, Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes (New York, 1928).

Significance of Study.-- It is the hope of the writer that the results of this study will awaken research-minded persons to concentrate in this area. The findings should also induce behavior-problem-testmakers to be more critical of some of their underlying assumptions.

These findings should be useful to teachers, parents, supervisors, truant officers and other persons interested in the welfare of children by enabling them to be aware of some of the behavior problems which might be expected from children of varying social classes. The writer further hopes that more attention will be directed to the so-called "problem child" in the classroom by the teachers and other persons who deal directly with the child.

Summary.-- This thesis has attempted to test the following hypothesis: there is a wide range of behavior problems in all social classes and that these behavior problems vary in each class qualitatively rather than quantitatively, as measured by the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A and the Stogdill Behavior Cards.

Material obtained from 50 subjects, 50 best friends, 50 least-liked acquaintances, and 10 teachers comprise the data. The subjects, the best friends, and least-liked acquaintances were classified as to position in a social status system. This was accomplished through a modification of Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. These ISC scores placed the subjects in the following social

classes: upper, upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, and lower-lower with 1, 8, 13, 17 and 11, respectively, coming from these five classes.

The subjects were rated on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule by their best friends, their teachers, and their least-liked acquaintances. They also rated themselves on the same scale. Null hypotheses were formulated to test differences and relationships between the variables. The relationship between the ratings by the best friends and least-liked acquaintances, was tested for significance. The difference between the means of the four social classes as rated by the teachers was tested for significance.

The subjects were asked to respond to the items on the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the standard error of the frequency was computed to determine if chance was operating in the responses given by the subjects. The reliability of the difference between the means obtained by the subjects in the various social classes on the Stogdill Behavior Cards was tested for significance.

The coefficients of correlation between scores on the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the self-ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule were computed for each class and tested for significance.

The behavior problems indicated by the responses from the Stogdill Behavior Cards and the ratings on the

Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule were itemized, ranked and compared for the various classes.

It was concluded on the basis of the ratings on the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedule: Schedule A and the responses to the Stogdill Behavior Cards that behavior problems exist in some quantity in all social classes, and, to some extent, occur more frequently in the lower classes. It was found that the type of behavior problems tends to vary in accordance with the social class of the subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Davis, Allison and Dollard, John. Children of Bondage. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940.
- Davis, Allison. Social Class Influence Upon Learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. Negro Youth at the Crossways. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940.
- Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley, 1949.
- Johnson, Charles S. Growing Up in the Black Belt. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and McKay, Henry O. Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency. Report on the Causes of Crime. Washington, D. C.: National Commission of Law Observance and Enforcement, 1931.
- Sutherland, Robert L. Color, Class and Personality. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1942.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Havighurst, Robert J., and Loeb, Martin B. Who Shall Be Educated? New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Junker, Buford, and Adams, Walter. Color and Human Nature. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Lunt, Paul S. The Social Life of a Modern Community. Yankee City Series, Vol. I. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Meeker, Marchia, and Eells, Kenneth. Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949.
- Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. New York: Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publications, 1928.

Monograph

- Milner, Esther. "Effects of Sex Roles and Social Status on the Early Adolescent Personality," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XL (1949) 231-235.

Articles

- Blanshard, Paul. "Negro Delinquency in New York," Journal of Educational Sociology, XVI (October, 1942), 115-23.
- Hentig, V. Hans. "The Criminality of the Colored Woman," University of Colorado Studies in Social Science, I (May, 1942) 231-60.
- Jenkins, Richard L. and Glickman, S. "Patterns of Personality Organization Among Delinquents," Nervous Child, VI (July, 1947), 329-39.
- Lurie, et. al. "Environmental Influences," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XIII (January, 1943), 150-62.
- Neugarten, Bernice L. "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children," The American Journal of Sociology, LI, No. 4 (January, 1946), 305-13.
- Schneckenburger, H. "Die Altersentwicklung und Milieubedingtheit des sozialethischen Verstandnisses beim proletarischen Kinde." (The development to maturity and the conditioning influence of the social ethical comprehension of the child of the proletarian), Zeitschrift fur angewandte Psychologie, XLII (1932) 24-447 as reviewed by Goodwin Watson, "Social Attitudes," in Review of Educational Research, V (June, 1935) 267.
- Watts, Frederick P. "A Comparative Clinical Study of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Negro Boys," Journal of Negro Education, X (April, 1941), 190-207.

Manuals

- Haggerty, M. E., Olson, W. C., and Wickman, E. K. Manual of Directions. New York; World Book Company, 1930.
- Stogdill, R. M. The Behavior Cards. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1941. (mimeographed)

Unpublished Materials

- McGuire, Carson J. "Social Status, Peer Status, and Social Mobility: A Guide for Research Workers." Unpublished memorandum, Committee on Human Development, The University of Chicago, 1948.
- Pierce, J. A. "The Atlanta Negro," The American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., in cooperation with the National Youth Administration for Georgia, Atlanta, 1940.
- Shaeffer, Louis E. "The Variation of Clinically Observed Adjustment Responses with Social Class Status in a Group of United States Army Soldiers." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1948.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, et. al. "Midwest Study." Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SC _____
ISC _____
No. _____

CLASSIFICATION SHEET

Directions: Please read the questions given below very carefully and answer them as truthfully as possible. This information will be used to get an idea about the things which seventh graders like. Feel free to ask any questions which will help you to fill out the form correctly.

* * * *

1. Name _____ Address _____
2. Write the name of your best friend in the seventh grade at your school who also knows you very well _____
- Write the name of the child whom you dislike most in the seventh grade at your school _____

* * *

3. Do you live with your mother? Yes _____ No _____. (Check the one which applies.) If no, do not answer the rest of the questions in this section, but answer those listed under Item 5.
- What is your mother's name? _____
- Does your mother work? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, what kind of work does she do? _____ Where does she work? _____
- What is the last grade that she completed in school? _____

* * *

4. Do you live with your father? Yes _____ No _____. If no, do not answer the rest of the questions in this section, but answer those under Item 5.
- What is your father's name? _____
- Does your father work? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, what kind of work does he do? _____
- Where does he work? _____ How many days a week does he work? _____
- What is the last grade he completed in school? _____

* * *

5. If you are not living with your mother or father, write the name of the person with whom you are living and who is directly responsible for your care.

Name	Relation to you
What type of work does this person do? _____	
Where does he-she work? _____	
How many days a week does he-she work? _____	
What is the last grade he-she completed in school? _____	
Write the name of another adult in your home who also supports you _____	
What type of work does this person do? _____	
Where does he-she work? _____	
What is the last grade he-she finished in school? _____	

APPENDIX B

PERSONALITY CARD

Name _____ No. _____
House No. _____
Sex _____ Age _____ Race _____ /
Occupation (head of household) _____ /
Source of Income _____ /
House Type _____ /
Dwelling Area _____ /
Social Class (est.) _____ ISC _____
Education (last year in school) _____ /

PERSONALITY CARD

Name _____ No. _____
House No. _____
Sex _____ Age _____ Race _____ /
Occupation (head of household) _____ /
Source of Income _____ /
House Type _____ /
Dwelling Area _____ /
Social Class (est) _____ ISC _____
Education (last year in school) _____ /

APPENDIX C

DERIVATION OF ISC'S AND SOCIAL CLASS FOR THE
SUBJECTS USED IN THIS STUDY

No.	Education in Years Completed	Occupation	Source of Income	Scale Values ¹			ISC ²	SC
1	20	Physician	Fees	1	1	3	20	U
2	19	Minister	Salary	1	1	4	24	UM
3	18	Minister	Salary	1	1	4	24	UM
4	16	Minister	Salary	2	1	4	27	UM
5	16	Minister	Salary	2	1	4	27	UM
6	19	Business School Teacher	Salary	1	2	4	29	UM
7	16	High School Teacher	Salary	2	2	4	32	UM
8	16	Employment Agent	Salary	2	3	4	37	UM
9	16	Elem. School Teacher	Salary	2	3	4	37	UM
10	16	Market Owner	Profits	2	4	3	38	LM
11	12	Printing Business	Profits	4	3	3	39	LM
12	15	Public Rela- tions Dir.	Salary	3	3	4	40	LM
13	15	Nursery Sch. Teacher	Salary	3	3	4	40	LM
14	16	Bookkeeper	Salary	2	4	4	42	LM
15	16	Railway Mail Clerk	Salary	2	4	4	42	LM
16	12	Filling Sta. Operator	Profits	4	4	3	44	LM
17	15	Railway Mail Clerk	Salary	3	4	4	45	LM
18	16	Plasterer	Wages	2	4	5	46	LM
19	11	Automobile Salesman	Commis- sions	5	3	4	46	LM
20	16	Postman	Salary	2	5	4	47	LM
21	16	Postman	Salary	2	5	4	47	LM

¹ These values are derived from the Index of Status Characteristics as reproduced in Appendix D.

² The ISC was derived by multiplying the scale values by the weights of 3, 5, and 4, respectively.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

No.	Education in Years Completed	Occupation	Source of Income	Scale Values ¹			ISC ²	SC
22	12	Cafe Owner	Profits	4	5	3	49	LM
23	11	Mechanic	Wages	5	4	5	55	UL
24	12	Chef Cook	Wages	4	5	5	57	UL
25	12	Beautician	Wages	4	5	5	57	UL
26	12	Shoe Repairman	Wages	4	5	5	57	UL
27	12	Beautician	Wages	4	5	5	57	UL
28	8	Tailor	Wages	6	4	5	58	UL
29	14	Maid	Wages	3	6	5	59	UL
30	14	Waitress	Wages	3	6	5	59	UL
31	10	Shoe Maker	Wages	5	5	5	60	UL
32	12	Truck Driver	Wages	4	6	5	62	UL
33	12	Maid	Wages	4	6	5	62	UL
34	12	Chauffeur	Wages	4	6	5	62	UL
35	8	Carpenter (appren- tice)	Wages	6	5	5	63	UL
36	8	Carpenter (appren- tice)	Wages	6	5	5	63	UL
37	11	Gas Station At- tendant	Wages	5	6	5	65	UL
38	6	Practical Nurse	Wages	7	5	5	66	UL
39	6	Upholsterer	Wages	7	5	5	66	UL
40	12	Laundress	Wages	4	7	5	67	LL
41	12	Porter	Wages	4	7	5	67	LL
42	10	Porter	Wages	5	7	5	70	LL
43	11	Porter	Wages	5	7	5	70	LL
44	7	Maid	Wages	7	6	5	71	LL
45	6	Maid	Wages	7	6	5	71	LL
46	4	Coffee Roaster	Wages	7	6	5	71	LL
47	8	Laborer	Wages	6	7	5	73	LL
48	9	Laborer	Wages	6	7	5	73	LL
49	6	Laborer (city)	Wages	7	7	5	76	LL
50	7	Laborer	Wages	7	7	5	76	LL

APPENDIX D

HAGGERTY-OLSON-WICKMAN
BEHAVIOR RATING SCHEDULES

By M. E. HAGGERTY, PH.D.

Dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota

W. C. OLSON, PH.D.

Director of Research in Child Development, University of Michigan

and E. K. WICKMAN

The Commonwealth Fund, New York City

Published by World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, and Chicago, Illinois
Copyright 1930 by the American Council on Education. Copyright in Great Britain

All rights reserved. HOW: BES-20

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

These scales are copyrighted. The reproduction of any part of them by mimeograph, hectograph, or in any other way, whether the reproductions are sold or furnished free for use, is a violation of the copyright law.

Behavior Rating

SCHEDULE A: BEHAVIOR PROBLEM RECORD

Score_____

Name_____School_____

Rating by_____Date_____, 19____Grade_____

DIRECTIONS FOR USING

Schedule A

Below is a list of behavior problems sometimes found in children. Put a cross (X) in the appropriate column after each item to designate how frequently such behavior has occurred in your experience with this child. A cross should appear in some column after each item. The numbers are to be disregarded in making your record. They are for use in scoring.

BEHAVIOR PROBLEM	FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE				SCORE
	Has never occurred	Has occurred once or twice but no more	Occasional occurrence	Frequent occurrence	
Disinterest in School Work	0	4	6	7	
Cheating	0	4	6	7	
Unnecessary Tardiness	0	4	6	7	
Lying	0	4	6	7	
Defiance to Discipline	0	4	6	7	
Marked Overactivity	0	8	12	14	
Unpopular with Children	0	8	12	14	
Temper Outbursts	0	8	12	14	
Bullying	0	8	12	14	
Speech Difficulties	0	8	12	14	
Imaginative Lying	0	12	18	21	
Sex Offenses	0	12	18	21	
Stealing	0	12	18	21	
Truancy	0	12	18	21	
Obscene Notes, Talk, or Pictures	0	12	18	21	

Directions for scoring. Transfer the numbers you have marked for the different items to the right-hand column, headed "Score." Add the numbers to secure the total score, and record the total in the upper right-hand corner of this sheet.

[2]

Total Score_____

Behavior Rating

SCHEDULE B: BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Score_____

Name_____Division I_____

School_____Grade_____Division II_____

Rating by_____Date_____, 19____Division III_____

Division IV_____

Total_____

DIRECTIONS FOR USING

Schedule B

- Do not consult anyone in making your judgments.
- In rating a person on a particular trait, disregard every other trait but that one. Many ratings are rendered valueless because the rater allows himself to be influenced by a general favorable or unfavorable impression that he has formed of the person.
- When you have satisfied yourself as to the standing of this person in the trait on which you are rating him, indicate your rating by placing a cross (X) immediately above the most appropriate descriptive phrase.
- If you are rating a child, try to make your ratings by comparing him with children of his own age.
- The masculine pronoun (he) has been used throughout for convenience. It applies whether the person whom you are rating is male or female.
- In making your ratings, disregard the small numbers which appear below the descriptive phrases. They are for use in scoring.

DIVISION I

1. How intelligent is he? Score_____

Feeble-minded (5) Dull (4) Equal of average child on street (3) Bright (2) Brilliant (1)

2. Is he abstracted or wide awake? Score_____

Continually absorbed in himself (5) Frequently becomes abstracted (4) Usually present-minded (2) Wide-awake (1) Keenly alive and alert (3)

3. Is his attention sustained? Score_____

Distracted: Jumps rapidly from one thing to another (5) Difficult to keep at task until completed (4) Attends adequately (3) Is absorbed in what he does (1) Able to hold attention for long periods (2)

4. Is he slow or quick in thinking? Score_____

Extremely slow (5) Sluggish, Plodding (4) Thinks with ordinary speed (2) Agile-minded (1) Exceedingly rapid (3)

5. Is he slovenly or careful in his thinking? Score_____

Very slovenly and illogical (5) Inexact, A dabbler (4) Moderately careful (2) Consistent and logical (1) Precise (3)

6. Is he mentally lazy or active? Score_____

Interests lazy and inert (5) Lethargic, Idles along (3) Is ordinarily active (2) Eager (1) Shows hyper-activity (4)

7. Is he indifferent or does he take interest in things? Score_____

Is indifferent, Unconcerned (5) Uninquisitive, Rarely interested (4) Displays usual curiosity and interest (1) Interests are easily aroused (2) Has consuming interest in almost everything (3)

Total, Division I_____

[3]

Behavior Rating

DIVISION II

Score_____

8. Is he slovenly or neat in personal appearance? Score_____

Unkempt, Very slovenly (5) Rather negligent (4) Inconspicuous (2) Is concerned about dress (1) Fastidious, Foppish (3)

9. How does he impress people with his physique and bearing? Score_____

Repulsive (5) Makes an unfavorable impression (4) Generally unnoticed physique and bearing (3) Makes a favorable impression (2) Excites admiration (1)

10. Can he compete with others on a physical basis? Score_____

Weak and handicapped (5) Has some physical difficulties (3) Can hold his own (2) Is stronger than most (1) Has exceptional strength (4)

11. What is his physical output of energy? Score_____

Extremely sluggish (5) Slow in action (3) Moves with required speed (2) Energetic, Vivacious (1) Over-active, Hyperkinetic, Meddling (4)

12. Is he easily fatigued? Score_____

Shows quick exhaustion (4) Does not have ordinary endurance (3) Endures satisfactorily (1) Rarely shows fatigue (2) Unusually vigorous and robust (5)

13. How does he impress you with regard to masculine or feminine traits? (NOTE. If subject is male, rate on first line; if female, use second line.) Score_____

Is a "sissy" (5) Slightly effeminate (3) Has average boy qualities (1) Very masculine (2) Entirely masculine, A "buck" (4)

A "tomboy" (5) Somewhat boyish (4) Has average girl qualities (2) Quite feminine (1) A "coquette," "Clinging vine" (3)

14. Does he lack nerve, or is he courageous? Score_____

White-livered, Fearful (4) Gets "cold feet" (3) Will take reasonable chances (1) Resolute (2) Daredevil (5)

Total, Division II_____

[4]

DIVISION III

15. Is he quiet or talkative?

Score _____

Speaks very rarely (3)	Usually quiet (1)	Upholds his end of talk (2)	Talks more than his share (4)	Jabbers (5)
---------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------

16. Is his behavior (honesty, morals, etc.) generally acceptable to ordinary social standards?

Unacceptable, Extreme violations (5)	Occasional violations (4)	Ordinarily acceptable (3)	Always acceptable (1)	Bends backward, Very rigid standards (2)
---	------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	---

17. What are his social habits?

Lives almost entirely to himself (4)	Follows few social activities (3)	Pursues usual social activities and customs (1)	Actively seeks social pleasures (2)	Prefers social activities to all else (5)
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	--

18. Is he shy or bold in social relationships?

Painfully self-conscious (4)	Timid, Frequently embarrassed (2)	Self-conscious on occasions (1)	Confident in himself (3)	Bold, Insensitive to social feelings (5)
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

19. Is his personality attractive?

Repulsive (5)	Disagreeable (4)	Unnoticed, Colorless (3)	Colorful (2)	Magnetic (1)
------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

20. How does he accept authority?

Defiant (5)	Critical of authority (4)	Ordinarily obedient (3)	Respectful, Complies by habit (1)	Entirely resigned, Accepts all authority (2)
----------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

21. How flexible is he?

Stubborn, Hidebound, Nonconformist (5)	Slow to accept new customs and methods (3)	Conforms willingly as necessity arises (2)	Quick to accept new customs and methods (1)	Easily persuaded, Flaccid, Unstable (4)
---	---	---	--	--

22. Is he rude or courteous?

Rude, Insulting, Insolent (5)	Sometimes unmannerly, Saucy (4)	Observes general conventions of civility and respect (3)	Courteous, Gracious (1)	Elegant (2)
----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---	----------------------------	----------------

23. Does he give in to others or does he assert himself?

Never asserts self, Servile (5)	Generally yields (4)	Holds his own, Yields when necessary (1)	Assertive (2)	Insistent, Obstinate (3)
------------------------------------	-------------------------	---	------------------	-----------------------------

24. What tendency has he to criticize others?

Never criticizes (3)	Rarely criticizes (1)	Comments on outstanding weaknesses or faults (2)	Has a critical attitude (4)	Extremely critical, Rarely approves (5)
-------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------------	--

Total, Division III _____

DIVISION IV

25. Is he even-tempered or moody?

Score

Stolid, Rare changes of mood (3)	Generally very even- tempered (1)	Is happy or depressed as conditions warrant (2)	Strong and frequent changes of mood (4)	Has periods of extreme elations or depressions (5)
---	--	--	--	---

26. Is he easily discouraged or is he persistent?

Melts before slight obstacles or objections (5)	Gives up before adequate trial (3)	Gives everything a fair trial (1)	Persists until convinced of mistake (2)	Never gives in, Obstinate (4)
--	---	--	--	--

27. Is he generally depressed or cheerful?

Dejected, Melancholic, In the dumps (3)	Generally dispirited (4)	Usually in good humor (1)	Cheerful, Animated, Chirping (2)	Hilarious (5)
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------

28. Is he sympathetic?

Inimical, Aggravating, Cruel (5)	Unsympathetic, Disobliging, Cold (4)	Ordinarily friendly and cordial (2)	Sympathetic, Warm-hearted (1)	Very affectionate (3)
---	---	--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------

29. How does he react to frustrations or to unpleasant situations?

Very submissive, Long-suffering (3)	Tolerant, Rarely blows up (2)	Generally self-controlled (1)	Impatient (4)	Easily irritated, Hot-headed, Explosive (5)
---	--	-------------------------------------	------------------	--

30. Does he worry or is he easy-going?

Constantly worrying about something, Has many anxieties (4)	Apprehensive, Often worries unduly (2)	Does not worry without cause (1)	Easy-going (3)	Entirely care free, Never worries, Light-hearted (5)
--	---	---	-------------------	---

31. How does he react to examination or to discussion of himself or his problems?

Refuses flatly to cooperate (5)	Volunteers nothing, Must be pumped (3)	Conservatively coöperative (2)	Quite willing to coöperate (1)	Entirely uninhibited, Tells everything, Enjoys it (4)
---------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

32. Is he suspicious or trustful?

Very suspicious, Distrustful (5)	Has to be assured (3)	Generally unsuspicious and trustful (1)	Somewhat gullible (2)	Accepts every- thing without question (4)
--	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

33. Is he emotionally calm or excitable?

No emotional re- sponses, Apathetic, Stuporous (4)	Emotions are slowly aroused (2)	Responds quite normally (1)	Is easily aroused (3)	Extreme reactions, Hysterical, High-strung (5)
---	--	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

34. Is he negativistic or suggestible?

Negativistic, Contrary (5)	Complies slowly (4)	Is generally open-minded (1)	Rather easily persuaded (2)	Follows any suggestion (3)
----------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

35. Does he act impulsively or cautiously?

Impulsive, Bolts, Acts on the spur of the moment (5)	Frequently unreflective and imprudent (4)	Acts with reasonable care (2)	Deliberate (1)	Very cautious and calculating (3)
---	--	--	-------------------	---

Total, Division IV _____